REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example in FIG. 7 and its description in paragraph [0090].

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Goodman (US Patent No. 6,616,613) in view of Utsugi (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0056228). Claims 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Goodman in view of Utsugi, and further in view of Ogura (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0139675). Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Goodman in view of Utsugi , and further in view of Hatschek (U.S. Patent 5,309,916). Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Goodman in view of Utsugi, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0077960). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

To establish prima facie obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Claims 1 and 12 recite a display unit showing a prescription with a mark representing a correlation between indices. None of the cited prior art references teach or suggest the claimed display. Goodman shows, in FIG. 19, a sample screen capture of the output of the monitoring system on its display. Goodman neither teaches nor suggests a display that shows a prescription with a mark representing a correlation between indices. Utsugi does not cure this deficiency, and teaches only displaying prescriptions in response to a subject's physiological measurements. As set forth in paras. [0216] – [0220] of Utsugi, prescription data such as a "cosmetic C" is sent to a terminal based on a diagnosis. Such disclosure simply cannot teach or suggest, alone or in combination with any of the prior art references of record, a display that shows a prescription with a mark representing a correlation between indices. Indeed, the prior art of record as a whole does not teach or suggest the claimed display characteristics.

Therefore, prima facie obviousness has not been established and the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 14, 16 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 12 and are therefore allowable for the same reason. In view of the above, each of the pending claims in this application is in condition for allowance and applicants solicit early action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **163852020000**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2007

By: _____

Jill DeMello Hill
Registration No. 42,477

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7718
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777